THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. I. NEW SERIES. NO. 5 APRIL, 1951

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS,
METROPOLITAN OF THYATEIRA

IT is fitting that we should pay a tribute to the Orthodox President of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association, which along with the church life in this country and the Christian world outside, has suffered so grievous a loss by the sudden death of this great servant of God and of the Holy Orthodox Church. Towards the end of January Archbishop Germanos returned from a long and tiring itinerary which since May of 1950 had taken him to Canada, the United States, Greece and the Continent of Europe. Those of us who welcomed him on his return realized how tired he was, yet in good spirits and looking forward to the celebration in 1952 of the thirtieth anniversary of his appointment as exarch and representative of the Eucumenical Patriarch in this country, as well as his fortieth anniversary of consecration. His sudden illness and death came as a great shock.

For some days before the funeral service in the Greek Cathedral of the Holy Wisdom, which had been for over a quarter of a century his episcopal seat, his body lay in state in the crypt, and was visited by great numbers of his flock in this country and by many friends. For those who saw his body there in its last sleep there remains the deep impression of the dignity and peace of the servant of Christ who had run his course and fought the fight and received his reward. On Saturday, February 3rd, the funeral took place in the Cathedral. This service was presided over by the Metropolitan Athenagoras of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, assisted by the Archbishop of Edessa and Pella, representing the Church of Greece, Bishop Cassian from Paris, and Archbishop Sawa of Grodno. In the throne for this occasion was the Archbishop of Canterbury attended by two chaplains, while the Bishop of Chichester was at his side. The Bishop of London was represented by the Bishop of Fulham and the Scottish Church by the Dean of Westminster. The Bishop of Gibraltar was also present. Representatives of the World Council of Churches were given seats in choir. The service, which according to the Orthodox rite consists of a series of psalms, anthems, Epistle and Gospel, followed by prayers, was in Greek, Slavonic and English. The Epistle in English was read by the Bishop of Chichester and the Gospel by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In conclusion there was an allocution by the Metropolitan Athenagoras, and finally the coffin was carried out of the Cathedral for burial. On it had lain the insignia of his high ecclesiastical office, and on cushions nearby the many decorations,

including the Lambeth Cross, which the late Archbishop had received during his distinguished career.

On February 10th, a week after, the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association, acting with the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, of which he was the honorary President held (by the kindness of the Dean and Chapter), a Requiem in St. Paul's Cathedral. At this the Bishop of London presided. The Archbishop of Canterbury was represented by Bishop Buxton, formerly of Gibraltar, and the Bishop of Derby attended as Anglican President of the Fellowship. In the presence of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, the Liturgy was sung by three of the College of Minor Canons. A representative congregation had gathered, and the Orthodox clergy with the Ambassador and Minister of Greece were in choir. The music of the Requiem Eucharist was sung by St. Paul's choir and was particularly beautiful and moving. For the offertory Bairstow's setting of a translation into English of "Let all mortal flesh keep silence" will not be forgotten by those who heard it. The familiar Contakion of the Departed closed the service. It was a dignified and splendid occasion in our great cathedral, worthy of the affection and esteem in which the late Archbishop was held by us, and by so many of his Anglican friends and co-workers in the cause of reunion.

This tribute would not be complete without some account of the life of Archbishop Germanos. He was born in Western Thrace in 1872 at a time when that part of Thrace was still under Turkish dominion. He received his education at the Central School of the Phanar and at Halki Theological College in the Propontis near Constantinople and at the Universities of Halle, Leipzig, Strasbourg and Lausanne, receiving his doctorates both of theology and philosophy. After returning from Germany in 1904, he became Professor of Divinity at Halki, and was appointed Director of the College in 1907. In 1912 he was consecrated Metropolitan of Seleucia, and remained in charge of the College until 1922. During this period of nearly twenty years he became the spiritual and intellectual father of a great number of students, many of whom are in high office in the Orthodox Church to-day.

In 1922, Archbishop Germanos was appointed Exarch in Central and Northern Europe and apokrisarios to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the ecumenical throne of Constantinople. This was a very important step in our relations with Orthodoxy, which we owe to the zeal and foresight of the great Patriarch Meletios. With the title of Thyateira the Archbishop was the first hierarch to be sent to reside in this country. During the twenty-nine years of his stay among us he was untiring in his efforts towards better understanding and closer friendly relations.

As his old friend Canon Douglas has reminded us in the press, Archbishop Germanos's first loyalty love and service was towards the see of Constantinople, the ecumenical Patriarchate and what has ever been known to Church history as the Great Church of Christ. The stringency of political changes in Turkey since the establishment of the republic made it impossible for him to set foot in Istanbul, to revisit the Phanar and his beloved College, to see again the familiar outline of that great city and the splendour of Justinian's Church and dome of the Holy Wisdom. Yet we learn that he

looked forward to spending his last days in his native Thrace. Now he has been called to his nobler inheritance in the heavenly archetype of all beloved earthly cities and homes. May his soul rest in peace.

I

RUMANIA AND THE CONFERENCE AT BUCHAREST, 1935

[These two articles, the first of a series by the Right Reverend H. J. Buxton, formerly Bishop of Gibraltar, are part of a book written, he tells us, primarily for the younger members of his family. We are grateful for his permission to publish them in *The Christian East*, not only because of Bishop Buxton's distinguished record and work in his Anglican diocese that covers so many of the Orthodox countries of south-eastern Europe, but for their intrinsic value. The bishop is able to describe and comment upon matters of great importance for our Anglo-Orthodox relations with the special authority of his intimate knowledge and high office. EDITOR.]

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

"We are desirous that friendly relations should be established between the two Churches. Whenever we pay them official visits they receive us with courtesy and friendly regard, and treat us as *brethren*."

BISHOP SANDFORD (1874–1903) of Gibraltar, in a Pastoral Address.

THE years preceding the second great war were especially hopeful for the cause of Reunion in southern Europe, the attitude of the Orthodox Church in Rumania having been notably encouraging. Since the war martial preoccupations, political upheavals, and drastic realignment of the traditional form of government and the exile of Rumanian royalty brought all efforts for a Church *rapprochement* to a standstill. Within the Iron Curtain our diocese has no chaplains at all, although it should be added that the number of resident British civilians in Yugoslavia, Rumania and Bulgaria is at present inconsiderable; the influence no doubt by indirect pressure from Moscow. Nevertheless, it is inconceivable that Rumanian Orthodoxy can remain unmindful of former cordial associations with the Anglican Church, and that the existing hiatus is other than temporary.

It is pleasant—if, at the moment, nostalgic—to recall that in 1922 the Patriarch Meletios invited the Orthodox Churches to accord recognition to Anglican ordinations, and that three years later the Rumanian Church emphasized its close interest in the matter by posing certain questions for the consideration of the Lambeth Conference.

In 1930 the Lambeth Conference took place, Rumania being represented by Archbishop Nectarie, who submitted a full report of the discussions on his return to Bucharest. The Orthodox delegates in London had prepared four questions concerned with Ultimate Authority, Church Discipline, Holy Orders, Holy Eucharist. The Anglican replies were prepared by a Commission of Anglican Bishops and accepted by the Plenum of the Lambeth Conference.

Arising out of this clarification, Patriarch Meletios was thus enabled to carry Alexandria with him in the official recognition of Anglican Orders.

But events continued to move with customary Eastern slowness. The Patriarch and the Holy Synod of Rumania deferred further action until

1934, when its Commission entrusted with the Anglican question suggested a further meeting of Anglicans and Orthodox. A personal conversation in the same year with Bishop Titus Semendria at Bucharest, led up to his suggestion that the proposed conference might prove fruitful if it were to centre around the Lambeth agreements. Finally, an invitation was received from the Patriarch Miron, and the Archbishop of Canterbury nominated a deputation of Anglicans to visit Bucharest during 1935. The chairman of the Church of England delegation was the Rt. Rev. Dr. Hicks, Bishop of Lincoln, my predecessor at Gibraltar, and with him were the Bishop of Fulham, the Dean of York, Canon Douglas, Dr. Macdonald, Canon Sharp, the Rev. Philip Usher and myself. The delegation was accompanied by two 'assessors,' the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Gregg, and the Rev. Professor Dr. Frank Gavin, of the American Church.

The part played by the Patriarch of the Rumanian Orthodox in bringing about this personal interchange of views was decisive. To what extent Queen Marie—herself an Anglican—had encouraged the Patriarch in the matter is not known, but from conversations with her Majesty, whose death in 1934 was a matter for the widest regret, I am confident that she desired and would have welcomed this *rapprochement* of the two Churches.

The Patriarch Miron Christea was a commanding figure, and his influence could be sensed in many directions. The peace and unity of the Orthodox Communion, and a more intimate mutual knowledge of its members, represented to him an ideal to which he paid more than lip-service. He warmly espoused the exchange of theological students, encouraging students of other Orthodox Churches to study in Rumania, and conversely, sent Rumanian students to work at Athens and other centres of theological erudition.

The close of the Conference in 1935 was pleasantly marked by the Patriarch's invitation to Anglican students, from Mirfield and elsewhere, to spend an academic year at one or other of the theological centres in Rumania. As a result, Walton Hannah, Pierce, Green, Woods, Vince and others came out to Rumania and lived in Orthodox seminaries at Arad Sibiu, Cernauti and other of the seminaries for which Rumania has long been distinguished.

There is no necessity to describe, in detail, the elaborate programme of discussions. But looking back I regard those ten strenuous days at Bucharest as one of the most interesting episodes in my time as Bishop of Gibraltar. We were guests of His Beatitude in his own house, opening the Conference on Saturday, June 1st, with papers dealing with the question of Apostolical Succession. The following Monday was devoted to the question of the Priesthood, and Wednesday, June 5th, to Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition. The Friday was devoted to the question of the Holy Sacraments; Justification, and Christian Life and Work being discussed on the following day. On the Sunday, with the Legation Chaplain, Mr. H. Farrie, I arranged a Sung Eucharist at the English Church in Bucharest. This was attended by the Patriarch, who used a throne in the sanctuary, and by the Rumanian delegates to the Conference.

The final meetings were held on Monday, June 10th, and the findings of the Conference, summarized in a report signed by all delegates, were duly

submitted to the Holy Synod at Bucharest in March 1936 and accepted. Two months later, the report having been presented to the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, Canon Anthony Deane moved a resolution indicating the measure of agreement which had been reached at Bucharest, and expressing the hope that it would lead to yet closer relations with the Rumanian Church and other branches of the Orthodox Communion. The resolution was carried. Both Convocations—Canterbury and York—implemented the report in 1937.

In November of the same year, a night journey from Bucharest in the company of the Rev. John Boys, brought me to Cernauti, in the extreme north of Rumania, some thirty miles from the Polish border, and forty from the Russian frontier. Diary: "Cernauti is the official residence of the Archbishop of Bukovina. And what a magnificent residence it is! Its vastness is such that Lambeth Palace is dwarfed by comparison.

"The splendour of this ecclesiastical domicile is explained by the fact that a century ago the Austrian Emperors were accustomed to delegating part of their authority to Rumanian Archbishops resident in the more distant parts of their domains. As imperial delegates their residences would need to be representative of their authority. The Province of Bukovina had been scarcely affected by attempts to 'Uniatize' the population, and the Orthodox monasteries have not shared the fate of others in various parts of the realm.

"The Church continues to be the moving factor in the lives of the people. Cernauti University has a student-roll running into thousands—youths drawn to this centre of culture from the villages and hamlets of Rumania, attracted by the nominal fees and the subsistence 'pensions' granted to the impecunious. At the time of my visit there were several hundreds of students in theology, it being explained that the inflow of candidates for ordination is much greater than the demand.

"The Rumanian peasant, in common with the Serbian and Balkan peoples generally, is ready to shoulder any sacrifice in the cause of education. It is his dearest ambition that his son shall savour to the full such educational advantages as were denied him and that, above all else, the lad shall 'grow up to be a gentleman.' Hence the, at times serious, congestion at these centres of learning throughout the country.

"The more fortunate enjoy free board and lodging within the walls of the Archbishop's residence at the 'Internat.' Specially selected candidates, they enter a course of four years' study under conditions of austerity and strict discipline. The Director, at the time of my visit, was the Rev. Father Vasca, zealous and evangelical in spirit, an admirable mentor for his ordinands."

At a banquet in honour of his Anglican visitors on the second evening of our visit, held in the magnificent hall of the residence, an apartment richly ornate with marble pillars, costly mosaics, gilded balconies and inlaid furniture, the Archbishop reminded his guests "The implementation of the Bucharest Report by the Convocations of Canterbury and York . . . was a notable step towards Reunion. The agreement thus ratified makes no pretence of establishing full inter-communion. Yet a dogmatic agreement,

while not complete or final, does bring that ultimate stage perceptibly nearer."

A visit to the monasteries and the wonderful painted churches followed.

Again in Rumania in 1938, this time to Arad where, with my chaplain, the Rev. John Boys, we were met at the frontier by Professor Vintila Popescu. With him as cicerone we stayed as guests of the Bishop Andreiu Magier from Michaelmas Day, September 29th, to October 3rd. On the Saturday the College Chapel of the Academy was placed at our disposal, with its altar and vessels. Bread and wine having been provided by College, I celebrated the Anglican Liturgy and gave Communion to our Church of England members. On the Sunday I attended the Orthodox Liturgy in the Arad Cathedral, afterwards attending the ceremony of the opening of the new academic order.

It was a matter for regret that the exigencies of travel did not permit a visit to Maglavit village, where Lupu the shepherd preached his simple message "Love God, Come to Christ, And do not sin." The visions and arresting eloquence of the Rumanian shepherd preacher, it is said, attracted over a million visitors. Father Shearborn, C.R., who visited and listened to the shepherd's nation-wide appeal, assured me: "There is a refreshing sanity about it all."

No less distinguished a spiritual leader, whom we had the felicity of meeting personally at Sibiu, was Archbishop Balan, Metropolitan of Transylvania and Banat, whose labours for the moral, spiritual and intellectual welfare of the Church are something of a legend. Not only does he stir up apostolic zeal; his insistence on a greater measure of culture for the Rumanian clergy is backed by ways and means of implementing this admirable aim. "Apostolic zeal alone," he insists, "is capable of melting the scepticism of souls in this materialistic world. Only a really aggressive missionary energy can bring down the idealism of faith into practical every-day life. To-day it is not enough to say 'God has spoken—at some time or other—through prophets and apostles.' We must make men feel that their God is speaking to them to-day."

"I know very well," admits the Archbishop, "that the Apostles were not themselves students of Athens, of Alexandria, or Thyateira, but that the grace of God worked through them. I am not such a devotee of the fetish of culture as to suppose that the culture by itself can save man." But it is his conviction that unless the priest attains to a high level of culture, his labours in the complex environment of life as it is to-day, must be hindered thereby.

These outstanding figures in Rumania's spiritual life enjoy a reputation extending far beyond their natural borders. The sincerity of their teachings and the ardour of their mission continue to be an inspiration to the West, holding promise of that closer union that, in God's good time, must come to fruition.

The Bucharest which greeted us in the Autumn of 1939 was an infinitely more chastened capital than that which we recalled some four years earlier. Overshadowing everything in that fateful September was the martyrdom of Poland. The tragedy of unprovoked aggression, the brutal assault on the citizens of Warsaw, dominated the thoughts and coloured the

conversation of Rumanians of every social stratum. In our midst at the time were our Ambassador from Warsaw and many members of the Embassy personnel, a considerable group of other British refugees and—apart from the exiled Polish Government itself—at least thirty to forty thousand Polish nationals seeking sanctuary from the murderous attacks of German bombers and their juggernaut tanks.

At no time in my experience—embracing as it does the Balkan War, the two Great Wars and the Spanish Civil War—have I listened to stories or seen mental and physical distress so pitiable and acute. Rumanians, particularly those hitherto led to admire Aryan 'superiority,' were thus able to apprehend at first hand the 'ideals' of Hitlerism and the sinister objectives of the chancellery at Berlin. To a traditionally religious people these revelations came with an impact which was sensational. We were to hear, time after time, eye-witness stories of mechanized butchery of peasant women and children in the country lanes and the fields of "Fair Poland"; of the gallant but ineffective attempts of Polish patriots to challenge the German menace in the air and the serried rows of mighty tanks below. By way of contrast to the face-to-face warfare of earlier days, I was told by a Polish officer who had passed through the furnace, that despite the aerial armada above Warsaw and the tanks dealing death in wholesale fashion, he had never either sight or sound of a single German soldier's face.

Grief-stricken Bucharest, to which I had come by air from Belgrade, had scarce recovered from the shock of the Polish holocaust when the Prime Minister, M. Armand Calinescu, driving home in his car at the lunch hour, was assassinated by agents of the fascist "Iron Guard" on one of the main boulevards of the capital. The entire city filed in solemn procession past the Athenée, where the body lay in state for the following days. On Sunday, September 24th, we said a Requiem at the Anglican Church and remained standing for the Dead March at the close of the service. A message of sympathy was despatched from the English congregation.

Hopes of an immediate meeting with the new Patriarch, Nicodim, were shattered by this tragic happening. Two days later His Beatitude received me at the Patriarchate. My note-book records the meeting: "Naturally we miss the late Miron Christea: yet we are conscious that the same cordiality and helpfulness will be met with under the new Primate. If anything, he is even more forthcoming than his predecessor, and moreover he is free from the intolerable weight of responsibility which must necessarily fall upon a Prime Minister. A man of great personal dignity and of high spirituality, he is recognized as one of the foremost scholars of the Rumanian Church."

Rumania, meanwhile, must needs bow her head to circumstances beyond her control. If, for the time being, her frontiers are closed to us, there is at least the satisfaction of knowing that her spiritual leaders have the cause of Union at heart; that the vicissitudes through which she is passing will but strengthen her declared resolve.

II

A WARTIME MISSION IN SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

THE spring of 1940 found us once again in Rumania, its people apprehensive both about the outcome of the war, and its Danubian repercussions. Outwardly, Bucharest was unchanged, except for the still considerable addition of refugees from Poland.

At the Conference of 1935 the Anglican delegation,[1] charged with the furtherance of relations with the Orthodox Church, had concerned itself particularly with the questions of Ministry and Sacraments. It was therefore suggested as appropriate on this occasion that we should discuss the questions of Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition. Although, in the past, we appeared to have reached a measure of mutual understanding, it is well to recognize and frankly accept the fact that our ways of thinking are not alike. Some Eastern Orthodox writers have referred to Anglican 'instability' and our 'rationalism'; for the reason that, to them, dogmatic statements are immovable and unchangeable. They have not felt the *need* to reinterpret or explain the Faith in the light of the fluctuations of current science or philosophy.

There was, however, insufficient time for a further Conference. Our programme had been scheduled to include a lecture by the Bishop of Southwark on the general position of the Church of England, but it so happened that our visit coincided with the Orthodox-Easter celebrations, which continued all the week, so that the lecture was not delivered as planned. Father Galdau translated and printed the lecture, which was widely distributed and evoked fresh interest.

The Patriarch was ill, but was good enough to rise from his bed and accord the visitors a gracious welcome. Receptions were held at the British Legation and at the rooms of the Anglo-Rumanian Society. It having been suggested by the Patriarch that a broadcast message would be appropriate, and the Foreign Minister, M. Gafencu having approved, I addressed the Rumanians in English, Father Galdau translating it into Rumanian.

The chaplains, Padre Bell and Padre Stevens, having made excellent preparations, we celebrated a Sung Eucharist at the English Church on (our) Ascension Day, May 2nd, to which the Patriarch was invited. Archimandrite Mitrofor and Professor Scriban, with other clerics, attended on his behalf, the Patriarch's delegate taking his place in the sanctuary during the service, addressing a brief message to our congregation at the close.

Arriving at Belgrade on May 3rd, we were met by the Bishop of Gloucester and Philip Usher. The Anglican position should, by now, be familiar in its broad outlines to Orthodox leaders in southern Europe. Two generations have passed since the position was clarified at Lambeth Palace in the "Lambeth Quadrilateral"—Sacraments. Then followed the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930, when certain further propositions were formulated, and when the Orthodox Churches were specially invited to accept, or at least pass an opinion on them as to their suitability as a basis, not for Reunion, but for Economic Intercommunion.

[1] Members: Bishops Headlam, Parsons and Buxton; Canon Douglas; Revs. P. Usher and W. Hannah.

Constantinople took the lead in responding in 1922, followed by Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus and Rumania between the years 1923–1935. No response had hitherto been received, however, from Belgrade, Sofia or Athens. The Russian Church, it is recognized, must perforce be omitted, since it cannot function normally or canonically under existing political conditions in the U.S.S.R. The ultimate goal of our little deputation was to inquire into the likelihood of eliciting a response from Belgrade, Sofia and Athens; to challenge their respective spiritual leaders to bring about a *modus vivendi* between the Churches—at that time a matter of some urgency—and to inquire by what means that *modus vivendi* might be attained.

On Saturday, May 4th, we lunched with some of our own Legation staff, and with the Press Attachés—Syme, a don of Trinity, Oxford, Lyell, a don of New College, Oxford, Amery, a son of the Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery, and Maitland of *The Times*. We were guests at dinner of M. Marbearitch, Serb Minister of Cults and Education.

The following day (Sunday) was spent at the Patriarchal Palace at Carlovci, as guests of the Patriarch Gavril, and in attending a magnificent con-celebration of the Liturgy, i.e., sung by the Patriarch himself, two assisting bishops at the altar with him. Later, the British Minister attended the luncheon which followed.

On the Monday the party laid a wreath on the tomb of King Alexander at Oplenatz and were met there by Bishop Nicolai.

The following day the Conference assembled in the new Synod building at Belgrade, and after prayers in the Patriarch's Chapel at 9 a.m., the Anglican-Serbian Orthodox Preliminary Conference was opened by the Bishop of Novi Sad, Dr. Irenaus, who assumed the chair.

Speaking for the Serbian Orthodox, rather than for himself, the bishop posed two formal objections or difficulties which presented themselves. These were (a) the existence of "Schools of thought" in the Church of England and (b) the apparently Calvinistic flavour of certain of the Thirty-nine Articles. Dr. Irenaus admitted, however, that the Church of England had, more or less authoritatively, indicated that the Articles must be interpreted according to the Prayer Book; that they were "secondary to" the Prayer Book. Comments upon these matters would be welcome, he said, but he did not regard them as presenting insuperable difficulties. It was at this stage that the Bishop of Gloucester indicated the underlying motive of the meeting. We were not asking for, or even thinking of Reunion—which was not, at all events, on the horizon—but that we desired to learn whether the Serb Orthodox were prepared, or not, to take, for example, one very small step, such as had been taken years ago by the older historic Patriarchates and, in 1935, by the Rumanian Patriarchate—a step in particular towards the mutual recognition of the validity of our Ordinations.

The reply of the Bishop of Novi Sad was definite: The Serb Church, he explained, had never approved the action of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1922, nor of the Pro-Synod at Constantinople, in according even limited recognition to Anglican Ordinations (placing them on a level with Roman Catholic and Armenian Ordinations). Nor did the Serb Church identify

itself with the similar action of other Autocephalous Orthodox Churches at subsequent dates.

The Anglicans inquired the reason for this attitude, to which the bishop answered that in the view of the Serbian Church all such action was *ultra vires*. No decision on a matter of such importance should have been arrived at without the calling of an Ecumenical Pan-Orthodox Synod and, above all, without the attendance of delegates from the largest, numerically, of all Orthodox Churches—the Russian.

At this stage in the proceedings the debate assumed an unanticipated degree of warmth! Every delegate, it appeared, was anxious to express an opinion. It was Dr. Headlam who stepped into the breach with the observation that whilst some Evangelicals regarded the Thirty-nine Articles as of primary importance, the Lambeth Conference did not, nor the majority of Anglicans, some of the autonomous Anglican Churches considering them as of historical interest only. The Anglican Church, he explained to our Serbian inquirers, was wonderfully and supernaturally held together by a common spirit, by Lambeth Conferences, by the Quadrilateral, and by the Prayer Book.

It was at this stage that the question of 'decisions' by autonomous Orthodox Churches was challenged by both Bishop Headlam and Canon Douglas, the visitors reminding their auditors that not alone did the Serbs fail to grasp what Anglicans were asking, but they were not so fully acquainted as they might be with the history of this controversy. We sought 'economic' recognition only, and it was essential to distinguish between abstract validity—or validity for all time—and "acceptance for the time being," until a Pan-Orthodox Synod meeting was possible. Economic recognition it was stressed—acceptance, that was, for the time—was a small step, yet an absolutely essential step if further *rapprochement* or genuine co-operation was to be made possible in the future.

The Russian aspect of the situation was crystallized in the opinions adduced by their four distinguished theologians—Sokoloff, Bulgakoff, Glubokovsky and the Metropolitan Antoni—quotations from whose writings were cited as having been favourable to participation by the Russian Church without the condition, put forward by the Serbs, of an Ecumenical Synod. The Russian member of the Conference, Fr. Florovsky, spoke against action by the Serbs, appealing to Slav sentiment and to Slav loyalty generally.

It was made very clear, from the nature of the Serbian misapprehensions, that very few of the Orthodox clergy anywhere had access to reliable information regarding the Anglican Church. Such, I explained, was the experience in my diocese. It might be that we ourselves were largely remiss in our lack of information and literature in other languages. Whatever the basic reason for this want of accurate knowledge, the Orthodox clergy did, in fact, hear of us through Roman Catholic (hostile) literature which misrepresents Anglicans as one of a 'bloc' of Protestant sects. The great Patriarch Philaret, universally esteemed among Orthodox writers on the subject, knew of the Thirty-nine Articles only through Jesuit interpretations.

Although the contact yielded no concrete results, it did give rise to a

resolution, signed by the Bishop of Novi Sad and the Bishop of Gloucester, which leaves the door open for future discussion and co-operation :

> " While recognizing fully that no final decision on the question of Anglican Ordinations can be arrived at without the concurrence of the Russian, as of all the other Autocephalous Churches, this Conference requests the Church of the Serbian Patriarchate, acting in harmony with what other branches of the Orthodox Church have done, to examine the question of Anglican Ordinations, and to express a provisional opinion for presentation to the next Lambeth Conference."

Meanwhile the party attended various public functions, the local Press devoting considerable space to recording our activities. The cumulative effect of the visit was certainly greater than we had anticipated.

It was this Conference which—a contingency not unanticipated by Lambeth Palace—drew forth the vilification of Germans in Yugoslavia, and the allegation that we were attempting, but by subtle means, to induce the Yugoslavians to join the Allies. In Press and on the radio, German comments reached the zenith of fantastic abuse, the crowning canard of all being the statement that each member of our party pleaded on his knees imploring the Patriarch to influence his Government to espouse the Allies' cause! The Anglophobe campaign was all the more remarkable, in light of the fact that German pressure to induce Yugoslavia to support Hitler's war aim in practical fashion, was then being brought to bear in the most influential quarters.

In the *Daily Telegraph* of May 6th, 1940, the Germans were reported to be posing as " injured innocents " :

> " The Germans in Yugoslavia have now launched a campaign of abuse and vilification. They allege that the movements of ' innocent German tourists and business men ' are being restricted, whereas British and French political agents receive privileges. The length to which these slanders are pressed may be gauged when it is stated that the ' political agents ' include the Anglican Bishops of Gibraltar and Southwark, and Canon Douglas, Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, who are on a missionary tour of the Balkan States and are striving for closer understanding between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. Any impressions the German accusations have made in Yugoslavia can be described only as unpleasant."

Bulgaria came next in our party's itinerary, an informal conference being held in the office of the Holy Synod, Sofia, on May 13th, between representatives of the Holy Synod of Bulgaria and representatives of the Church of England nominated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In his address of welcome to the Anglican representatives, the Metropolitan Stephen of Sofia propounded the problems of the hour and the urgency of the need for the drawing together of all Churches for the salvation of the world. To this address of welcome the Bishop of Gloucester replied with warmly appreciative sentiments.

Bishop Paissy of Vratza having inquired whether the Church of England regarded Holy Orders as a " Mysterion," i.e., equal to Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, Canon Douglas suggested that the phrase " equal to " was

not satisfactory. Had the question been "Is Ordination of the same nature?" the Church of England—he would assert—would reply in the affirmative. Quoting Orthodox authorities, he cited Mitrophenes, who wrote that there is to be "no gradation" of Sacraments, nor "comparison between" them. Quoting St. John Damascene that the Holy Eucharist is "above" all other Sacraments, Canon Douglas emphasized the Anglican view that Orders are a necessity for the life of the Church and that, by our ordination, a priest is vested with authority to administer the Word and the Sacraments.

Speaking on Article 25, Professor Zankov sought enlightenment as to the Anglican assertion that certain Sacraments had "grown . . . of the corrupt following of the apostles." To this inquiry the Bishop of Gloucester tendered the explanation that "corrupt following" was a reference to the medieval, papalistic corruption of the Ordinances of the Church. This was the "corruption" which was condemned, not the Ordinances themselves.

It was right and fitting, the participants realized, that these theological perplexities should be thoroughly resolved, if only their explanation served to bring a little nearer the common goal of Reunion.

Here, for example, was Bishop Kiril of Plovdiv, with an admission of puzzlement at certain apparent contradictions between the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles. If, he suggested, the Articles were to be interpreted by the Prayer Book, their doubts and difficulties would largely disappear. To this the Bishop of Gloucester added that 317 bishops at Lambeth had made an identical statement.

Although the question of Union and Intercommunion was uppermost in the participants' mind, discussion was eventually restricted to the one simple, preliminary question: Whether the Bulgarian Church could rightly accept Anglican Ordinations—"*kata oikonomian*"—it being understood that unless the two Churches were enabled to accept each other's ministries, they would be unable to recognize each other's Church life.

This four-point synopsis crystallizes the position at the close of a by no means unfruitful conference with our Bulgarian brothers in Christ:

(1) The representatives of the Church of England declared that the Church holds it necessary for Ordinations in the Anglican Church to have Apostolic Succession.

(2) The representatives of the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Church accepted, as an historical fact, the unbroken Apostolic Succession in the Ordinations of the Anglican Church.

(3) The representatives of the Church of England declared that, inasmuch as the Church of England believes that the Holy Ghost is given, through the laying on of hands with prayer, it considers

(a) that Ordination is a Sacrament in the same sense as Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

(b) that, at Ordination, the ordained received in full measure Divine Authority, by the gift of the Holy Spirit for the Ministry—in his respective rank of Bishop, Priest or Deacon;

(c) that this is the general, accepted doctrine of the whole Anglican Church.

(4) The representatives of the Bulgarian Church agreed to present the above statement for the consideration of the Holy Synod, in full session.

The mutual hope was expressed of further similar meetings, the Conference closing with the Bishop of Gloucester's Blessing.

May 17th–25th, 1940

The Church of Greece had made but little official response to the 'advances' of the Church of England during the past two or three decades, a somewhat anomalous situation which induced the members of our party, before embarking upon the serious work of Conference at the University of Athens, to review the position to date. It was recalled that in 1922 the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Synod of Bishops at Constantinople had accorded a limited recognition of Anglican Orders—without first consulting the Faculty at Athens, and without deferring that recognition pending similar action by the other autocephalous Churches. With this procedure the Theological Faculty at Athens was not satisfied, and has until now taken no action in the matter either *pro* or *con*.

In 1939 the lay professors, without the bishops, examined the question afresh and published a report, a sizeable volume, of which the following is an Anglican summary:—*Re* Validity or Authenticity of Anglican Orders, and 'Economy.' God's 'Economy' is Divine Law, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." But there is an 'Economy' God proclaims—through the Sacrifice of Christ—"His sins are forgiven." 'Derived from this principle the Church also exercises 'Economy.' The Faculty now advise that a Pan-Orthodox Synod should consider their Report, and accept Anglican Orders by 'Economy.'

The discussions between our visiting party and the Greek professors were of particular interest.

The debate opened with the question: What are the conditions essential for a valid priesthood? It was agreed that they include (1) Succession from the Apostles, (2) Intention to confer the Sacerdotium (including the Offering of the bloodless Sacrifice, (3) Power of Absolution and (4) Participation in the Mystic Life of the Church.

Then Bishop Headlam followed with an inquiry for a definition of the Orthodox doctrine of the Church, a question which appeared to have taken the Greeks completely by surprise, none of the delegates appearing anxious to reply. Then, after a pause, Professor Trembellas (one of the seven lay delegates) explained "There is among us a clear dogmatic formulation on this matter. Briefly, the Church is visible—it is the Orthodox Apostolic Catholic Church. No one can be a member of the visible Church on earth who is not in communion with the Orthodox Church." "Then," interposed Bishop Headlam, "Roman Catholics are not members of the Church?" To this the reply came that they were not, nor were Armenians or any others. "But," continued the professor, "we do recognize the possibility that Roman Catholics and other 'Christians' may be members of the invisible Church, and as such known only to God."

In other words, the Orthodox are dogmatic as to their own 'territory,' but less dogmatic as to territory outside their own.

The discussion continued and dealt with many subjects, both theological and practical (such as the recognition of Anglican Marriages solemnized in Greece). Feeling became more and more friendly. There was no need for resolution (as at Belgrade and Sofia) because the printed Report and Recommendations of the Faculty come in due course before the Archbishop of Athens and his Synod.

Thus ended our wartime mission among the Churches of south-eastern Europe. The English party broke up on May 25th, and I left with Mr. Kemp for Malta.

☩ H. J. Buxton, *Bishop.*

CONCERNING THE THIRD MARK OF THE CHURCH CATHOLICITY

by Vladimir Lossky

We believe in the Church, one, holy, catholic and apostolic. Such is the Christian tradition concerning the Church, taught by the Fathers, declared by the Councils, conserved by Christendom down the ages.

No faithful Christian will ever hesitate to confess these four attributes of the Church which he believes to be true in virtue of that instinct for the truth and in virtue of that faculty which one may call 'innate' proper to all children of the Church, the instinct or faculty, which is faith. It is understood (or at least it is felt obscurely, but firmly) that the Church would be no longer the Church were she deprived of one of these attributes: that only the consensus of these four qualities professed in the Creed, expresses the fullness of her being. But when we are concerned with formulating and with distinguishing these attributes in finding out wherein lies the characteristic proper to each one of them, we tend to become vague through the use of two general definitions that are often of double meaning and which lead to confusion in the explanation of these attributes so precisely and clearly expressed in the Creed.

This happens especially when an attempt is made to define the third attribute of the Church that of catholicity.[1]

Here one feels is the tangled knot of all our difficulties: as long as catholicity remains ill-defined, we are involved inevitably in those confusions

[1] We are thinking particularly of the unwarranted use of the word *sobornost* by certain Russian authors who failed to translate the word by its French correlative *catholicité*. An attempt is made even to translate it by other terms such as 'concilarity,' Spirit of the Councils, 'symphony' and the like. All this is done to confront the Western reader with unfamiliar ideas that an "Orthodoxy for export" may be manufactured, which appears to be exotic and queer and only for the initiate. Confronted with this preciousness one is tempted to say with Molière "one must speak like a Christian if you want to be understood." It is what we wish to do in this short study of the concept of catholicity as it presents itself to Orthodox thought.

An etymological note on the word 'sorbornost' seems to us necessary. The Slavonic text of the Creed translates the adjective *catholic* of the original Greek very happily by the word *soborny*. From this Khomiakov produced the Russian neologism *sobornist*, which corresponds exactly to the idea of catholicity which he has developed in his writings on the Church; further, since the Slav root *sobor* means *assembly* and more particularly a council, or synod, the derived words *soborny, sobornast* thereby take on a fresh shade of meaning for the Russian ear, without losing their direct meaning of *catholic, catholicity*.

which obscure the logical distinction that must be maintained in the marks of the Church. Otherwise, if we are going to safeguard the rights of logic by avoiding every difficulty, the distinction remains superficial and artificial. There is nothing more dangerous, more contrary to true theology than a superficial clarity at the expense of profound analysis. Every logical distinction presupposes not only differences between the terms that are to be distinguished, but also some degree of concordance with one another which springs from a common ground, in virtue of which the distinction is possible. It is clear that the harmony of the four marks of the Church is of such a kind that to suppress or change the character of one member of this fourfold distinction would suppress the very concept of the Church, or at least would transform in their turn the character of the other marks.

For example, it would be impossible to imagine the Church without the mark of unity. St. Paul said so to the Corinthians who had divisions among themselves: "I am of Paul; and I am of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? (1 Cor. i. 12–13). Outside the unity of the Body of Christ who cannot be divided, the other marks—holiness, catholicity, apostolicity—themselves cannot subsist. In this case there is no longer the Church but a divided humanity, that of the confusion of Babel.

The Church also cannot be thought of without the mark of holiness. "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," said to St. Paul certain disciples of Ephesus, who have been baptized with the baptism of John which is that of penitence (Acts xix. 2–7). Deprived of that which is both the source and the end of her existence, she would be no longer the Church, but a mystical body other than that of Christ—a body deprived of spirit and yet existing, the body left to the shadows of death, and yet still awaiting its final destiny: such as the body of Israel, which has misunderstood the realization of the promise of the Spirit.

In the same way, the mark of apostolicity could not be taken away from the Church without also abolishing the other marks of the Church herself as having concrete historical reality. Without the divine power conferred on the Apostles by the risen God-Man (St. John xx. 22–23) and transmitted down to our own days by their successors, what would the Church be? A wraith of the "heavenly Church," disincarnate, on the one hand useless and abstract, on the other made up of a multitude of sects, endeavouring to reproduce "the spirit of the Gospel" lacking all objectivity, a prey to the arbitrariness of their *libre examen*, and to the expression of their anxious spirituality.

If the unity of the Church is based on the fact that she is a Body which has Christ as Head (Ephes. i. 23); if her holiness "the fullness of Him who fills all in all" is of the Holy Spirit who came down in the tongues of fire of the day of Pentecost; if her apostolicity dwells in the power of the same Spirit breathed into the Apostles by the breath of Christ and transmitted to their successors (Acts xx. 28): then not one of these three qualities can be either underestimated or modified without destroying or transforming the very essence of what we call the Church. It is the same with that which concerns catholicity—the mark which we are making the principal object of this study.

To grasp the meaning of catholicity, let us begin by making use of the same way by negation. Let us try to imagine what the Church would be if she were not catholic—an impossible task indeed, for, as we have already said, the four marks of the Church mutually support one another and cannot exist independently. Nevertheless, by eliminating in turn the part played by the other three marks, we have already essayed to obtain three different modes of what the Church would have been, were she not fully what she actually is. We are now concerned with seeing in what sense the Church would not be the Church, what would be her "mode of non-existence" were we to imagine her as one, holy . . . apostolic, but not catholic.

Already, we see at once the shape of our inquiry, and the yawning gap that it makes: the Church without Truth, without the assured knowledge of the data of revelation, without conscious and infallible experience of the divine mysteries. If she keeps her unity, it will be a unity of many opinions, the product of diverse human mentalities and cultures, a unity produced by administrative constraint or contingent indifference. If she keeps her holiness, the Church who has no assurance of the Truth, it will be an unconscious holiness, making its way towards sanctification without light on its path, in the darkness of not knowing what Grace is. If she keeps her apostolicity, it will only be the blind fidelity to an abstract principle, void of meaning.

Catholicity then shows itself to us as an inalienable mark of the Church in virtue of her possession of the Truth. Indeed one may say that it is a quality of Christian Truth. Thus one says, "catholic dogma," "catholic teaching," "catholic truth," often interchanging this term with that of "universal," which is very close to it in meaning.

Nevertheless, it is legitimate to ask whether catholicity means simply the universality of the truth preached by the Church? In a certain measure it is permissible to say so. Exteriorly, catholicity and universality coincide. Yet we must recognize that these two terms, catholicity and universality, are not perfectly synonymous expressions, in spite of the almost complete identity of their meaning, and in spite of the use made by hellenic Greek of the adjective καθολικός. Etymology is not always a reliable guide in the domain of speculation. A philosopher runs the risk of losing the true value of concepts when he attaches too much importance to their verbal expression: much more so the theologian, who must be free even of concepts, in that he finds himself confronted with realities that overpass all human thought. It seems to us incontestable that the word 'catholic' received a new meaning and that a Christian one in the language of the Church, which made it a special term, calling up a reality different from that which attaches itself to the general meaning of 'universal.' 'Catholic' means something at once more concrete, more intimate and which inheres in the very being of the Church.

In short, all truth may be said to be "universal," but all truth is not the "Catholic truth." This latter term points to Christian verity, in particular the mode of knowledge of this Truth proper to the Church, the teaching which she formulates. Does catholicity mean then universality in the more restricted and specialized acceptation of this word, in the sense of "Christian

universality?" This may be admitted, but once again with a certain reserve: universality has too abstract a character, catholicity is concrete.

Opinions or truths which are said to be 'universal,' are opinions or truths received as such by everybody, common to all without exception. It is clear that the Christian catholicity-universality cannot be understood in this sense. Yet one wants at times to identify 'catholicity' with the spread of the Church throughout the whole world, among all the peoples of the earth. If such a definition is taken literally, it would be necessary to recognize that the Church of the disciples gathered in the Upper Room in Zion on the day of Pentecost was far from being catholic; that the Church only became catholic in modern times, and that she is not yet definitely so. But we know quite well that the Church was always catholic. Thus we must distinguish between catholicity (equals Christian universality) in fact, and virtual catholicity or Christian universalism, the universalism of the Church and her message, spoken to the whole world, to the sum of that humanity which shall receive it and come into the Church.

This is clear. Nevertheless there is a sense of uneasiness in coming to the conclusion that we can only see in the catholicity of the Church a quality that is merely virtual.

If then we want to identify the catholicity of the Church with the universal character of the Christian mission, we shall find ourselves constrained to attribute the mark of catholicity to other religions besides Christianity. The remarkable spread of Buddhism over the face of Asia, the shattering conquests of Islam, have been due to a clear consciousness on the part of those who profess them that their mission is an universal one. It is possible to speak of a Buddhist or a Moslem universalism, but should we in any sense call them "Catholic religions?" Does not catholicity belong exclusively to the Church, her basic character?

If this is so, one must give up altogether the identification pure and simple of 'catholic' with 'universal.' "Christian universality" in fact or virtually must be distinguished from catholicity. It is a corollorary of catholicity, a quality that necessarily flows from it, and which is inseparably bound up with the catholicity of the Church, nothing less than her exterior and material expression. From the earliest ages of the Church this quality was called ecumenicity.

The οἰκουμένη meant for Hellenic antiquity "the inhabited world," the known world as contrasted with the unexplored desert, and the Ocean which surrounded the *orbis terrarum*, peopled by men, perhaps also in contrast with the unknown countries of the barbarians. The οἰκουμένη of the first centuries of the Christian era was thought of in particular as the ensemble of the countries of the Greco-Latin civilization, the Mediterranean world, the territory of the Roman Empire. For this reason the adjective οἰκουμενικός became a qualification of the Low Empire—"the Ecumenical Empire." Because the limits of the Empire co-incided more or less with the expansion of the Church towards the Constantinian epoch, the Church often used the term οἰκουμενικός. It was given as an honorific title to the bishops of the two imperial capitals, that of Rome, and later that of Constantinople the "New Rome." It was applied above all to the general councils of the Church that gathered together the episcopate of the

ecumenical empire. Thus 'ecumenical' marked what covered the totality of the Church territory, in contradistinction to what only had local value, or provincial (for example, a provincial council, a local cultus). It is here that we can grasp the difference between ecumenicity and catholicity: the Church as a whole is called ecumenical, a qualification which does not apply to any portion of her; but every smallest portion, even a single faithful one of her members, can be called Catholic. When St. Maximus, to whom ecclesiastical tradition gives the title of Confessor, replied to those who desired to force him to be in communion with the Monothelites "Even if the whole world (οἰκουμένη) should be in communion with you, I alone should not be," he was opposing his catholicity to an ecumenicity which was regarded as heretical. If the Christian universality spoken of as ecumenicity could be in an opposition so radical to catholicity, what then is the latter?

We have said earlier that catholicity is a quality of the revealed truth, given to the Church. One might say more exactly that it is a mode of knowledge of the Truth proper to the Church, in virtue of which this Truth becomes clear to the whole Church, as much to her totality as to each of her parts. It is for this reason that it is incumbent on every member of the Church to defend the Truth, as much on a layman as on a bishop, although the bishops are primarily responsible in the matter, because of the power that they are entrusted with. A layman is even bound to resist a bishop who betrays the Truth and is not faithful to the Christian tradition. For catholicity is not the abstract universalism of a doctrine imposed by the hierarchy, but a living tradition always preserved everywhere and by all—"*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*" To maintain the contrary would be to confuse catholicity with apostolicity, with the power of binding and loosing, judging and defining, proper to the successors of the Apostles. In that case however the interior evidence of truth disappears and tradition carefully kept by each one is replaced by submission to an exterior principle. At the same time we must not fall into the contrary error which occurs if giving it a charismatic character we confuse catholicity with holiness, seeing in this last the personal inspiration of the saints as the sole witnesses of the Truth, the only true Catholics. This would be to profess an error similar to Montanism, and to transform the Church into a mystical sect. One is not a Catholic because one is a saint, but one cannot be a saint without being a Catholic. Catholic truth carefully guarded by all bears the mark of an interior evidence more or less significant for every one according to the extent to which he is truly a member of the Church, and is not separated, whether as an individual or as the member of a particular group, from the unity of all in the Body of Christ. But then might not one say that catholicity is nothing other than a function of the unity of the Church, "the universal capacity of its principles of unity" as Père Congar would have it, he and the majority of those theologians who confuse these two marks of the Church, unity and catholicity?

It cannot be denied that there is a Christological consideration at the root of catholicity, without which catholicity itself could not exist. But this is far from affirming with Père Congar that the catholicity of her Head is the principle of the catholicity of the Church.

This Christological aspect of catholicity is of a negative character. The

Church, redeemed by the blood of Christ is pure of all spot, separated from the principles of this world, free of sin, of all exterior necessity, of all natural determinism. The unity of the Body of Christ is a sphere in which the Truth can manifest itself plainly, without any restriction, without any mixture with that which is a stranger to her, with any thing which is not the Truth. For her alone the Christological aspect (the unity of human nature recapitulated by Christ) cannot suffice. For her another condition, and that a positive one, is necessary in order that she becomes not only "the body of Christ," but also (as the same text of St. Paul has it) "the fulness of him who fills all in all" (Ephes. i. 23). Christ Himself said "I am come to send fire upon the earth," that the Holy Spirit may descend upon the Church. To desire to base the doctrine of the Church solely on the Incarnation, to see in the Church solely "an extension of the Incarnation," a continuation of the work of Christ, as is often stated, is to forget Pentecost, and to reduce the work of the Holy Spirit to a subordinate rôle, that of the emissary of Christ, and of an agency which links the Head with the members of the Body. But the work of the Holy Spirit, although inseparable from the work of Christ, is distinct from it. This is why St. Irenaeus, speaking of the Son and of the Spirit, calls them "the two hands of the Father" at work in the world. The pneumatological aspect of the Church must not be underestimated, but fully accepted on an equality with the Christological, if the true foundation of the catholicity of the Church is to be laid bare.

The Church is the work of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father into the world. As surely as she is the new unity of human nature, purified by Christ, the sole Body of Christ, so she is also the multiplicity of persons, each one of whom receives the Holy Spirit as a gift. The work of the Son has for its object the nature common to all—a nature redeemed, purified and recapitulated by Christ; the work of the Holy Spirit is directed upon persons, communicating the virtual fullness of Grace to each human hypostasis in the Church, making each member of the Body of Christ a conscious collaborator (συνεργός) with God, a personal witness of the Truth. For this reason the Holy Spirit appeared on the day of Pentecost in the multiplicity of tongues of fire: a distinct flame of fire came down and rested upon each one of those present; and down to this day a personal tongue of fire is invisibly communicated in the sacrament of the holy chrism to each person of those who enter into the unity of the Body of Christ by baptism. The *rapport* of the work of Christ with that of the Holy Spirit in the Church would appear to have the character of an antimony: the Holy Spirit diversifies that which Christ unifies. Nevertheless a perfect concord is supreme in this diversity, and an infinite richness manifests itself in this unity. But there is more: without this personal diversity, the natural unity could not be realized, and would be replaced by an exterior unity, abstract, administrative, blindly submitted to by the members of a collective body; just as in another connection, were it not for the unity of nature, there would be no place for the development of the diversity of persons and the capacity for transformation into its opposite, the mutual oppression of individual and limited beings. There can be no unity of nature without the diversity of persons, and no persons fully realized outside natural unity.

Catholicity consists in the perfect harmony of these two terms: unity and diversity, nature and persons.

Here we touch the very source of catholicity, the mysterious identity of the whole and of the parts, the distinction between human nature and persons, complete identity which is at the same time complete diversity—the initial mystery of the Christian revelation, the dogma of the Holy Trinity. If catholicity is, as we have already said, a quality of the Christian life, it is possible now to define this quality. It is concrete, in that it is the very content of Christian Truth, which is the revelation of the Holy Trinity, the Catholic dogma *par excellence*, from which the Church holds her catholicity. If the Church possesses catholicity it is because the Son and the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father, have revealed the Trinity to her; not in an abstract way, in the form of an intellectual apprehension, but as the very rule of her life. Catholicity is a bond, binding the Church to God, who reveals Himself to her as Trinity, while bestowing upon her the mode of being proper to the divine unity in diversity, an ordering of life "in the image of the Trinity." For this reason every dogmatic error touching the Trinity must find its expression in the conception of the catholicity of the Church, must translate itself into a profound change in the ecclesiastical organism. And vice versa: when a person, or a group, or an entire local church, falsifies in its historical development the perfect harmony, unity and diversity, this straying from the path of true catholicity will be the sure indication of a darkening in the knowledge of the Holy Trinity.

When, as often happens in the treatment of catholicity, the emphasis is placed on unity, when catholicity is above all other considerations based upon the dogma of the Body of Christ, then Christocentricism invades the theory of the Church. The catholicity of the Church becomes a function of her unity, becomes a universal doctrine that absorbs in imposing itself, instead of being a tradition evident to every person, affirmed by all, at all times and in all places, in an infinite richness of living witness. On the other hand, if the emphasis is placed on diversity at the expense of unity, there is a tendency to base catholicity exclusively on Pentecost, forgetting that the Holy Spirit was communicated in the unity of the Body of Christ. Here there is an approximation to the disagregation of the Church, when the truth that is attributed to the various inspirations of individuals becomes multiple, and therefore relative, when catholicity is found to be replaced by 'ecumenicity.'

Based upon these two conditions, Christological unity and diversity of the Spirit—inseparable from one another as the Word and the Spirit are inseparable—the Church faithfully preserves her catholicity which substantiates in her the dogma of the Trinity. We know the Holy Trinity through the Church, and the Church through the revelation of the Trinity. In the light of the dogma of the Trinity, catholicity becomes clear as the mysterious identity of the one and the many—unity which is diversified and diversity which remains one. As in God there is no one Nature apart from the three Persons, so in the Church there is no abstract universality but a complete harmony of Catholic diversity. As in God each One of the Three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is not a part of the Trinity, but fully

God in virtue of His ineffable identity with the One Nature, so the Church is not a federation of her parts: she is Catholic in each one of her parts, since each part in her is identified with the whole, expresses the whole, has the value which the whole has, does not exist outside the whole. For this reason catholicity finds various expressions in the history of the Church. Local synods as well as councils called ecumenical are able to preface their acts by the formula used since the first Council of all "It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." So Saint Basil, at a particularly grave juncture in the dogmatic fight, was able to cry with Catholic daring "Whosoever is not with me is not with the Truth."

Catholicity knows no "particular opinion" of a local or individual truth. A Catholic is one who overpasses the individual, who finds himself freed of his own nature, who identifies himself with the whole and constitutes himself a witness of the Truth in the name of the Church. Herein is the invincible force of the Fathers, of confessors and martyrs, as well as the tranquil assurance of the Councils. Even should the Council be divided, even if a Council canonically called together, yielding to pressure from without and to particular interests, becomes through the sins of men "a meeting of robbers," as was the conventicle of Ephesus, the catholicity of the Church will find its expression otherwheres, and will manifest itself to all as tradition that has been preserved always and everywhere. For the Church always recognizes her own, even those who bear the mark of catholicity.

If the Council, above all a general Council, is the most perfect expression of the catholicity of the Church and of her symphonic structure, we are not bound to believe that the infalliability of its judgment is assured solely by the canons that define the legitimate character of a Council. This is a necessary condition but not a sufficient one: the canons are not a magic recipe that constrain the Truth to express itself. To look for a criterion of the Christian Truth in canonical formulæ is tantamount to depriving the Truth of its interior evidence. It would make of catholicity an exterior function, exercised by the hierarchy; that is to say it would confuse the mark of catholicity with that of the apostolicity of the Church. Nor must we believe that Catholic truth is made subservient in its expression to something in the nature of an universal suffrage, to the affirmation of the majority: all the history of the Church witnesses to the opposite. Democracy in this sense is a stranger to the Church, a caricature of catholicity. "The Church," Khomiakov has said, "does not consist in the greater or lesser quantity of her members, but in the spiritual bond that unites them." The interior evidence of the Truth cannot make itself manifest if a constraint exercised by a majority on a minority is involved. Catholicity has nothing to do with "common opinion." There is no other criterion of truth than the Truth itself. And this Truth is the revelation of the Holy Trinity, who gives the Church her catholicity: an ineffable identity of the one with the many, in the image of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, consubstantial and indivisible.

(Translated by kind permission of the editors of "Dieu Vivant," Paris. A.O.)

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

Lecture II. Theological Outlines

IT is somewhat of an over-simplification, at any rate, to think of Eastern Orthodox Christianity as something mystical, to be associated with the mystical orient. But many Eastern Orthodox theologians have a cautious attitude to the claims of Natural or Rational Theology. The Greeks of the Byzantine Empire were always acquainted with Plato and Aristotle as part of Greek literature. But Aristotle was not regarded as having the same authority as a Christian saint. Eastern Christians, both Hellenic and non-Hellenic, tend to make an approach to theological issues characterized by reliance upon faith rather than upon apologetics. This may be called a 'mystical' approach, but the term has its dangers. In Greek theology the 'mysteries' are, first and foremost, the Incarnation and the Sacraments. The essence of mystery is that it is as plain to the initiated as it is dim and uncertain to the uninitiated. The mystical approach to theology is the approach proper to those who are already baptized and confirmed members of the Church. Thus the first memory connected with religion of many Orthodox people is that of being taken to church to join in the liturgy and to communicate in the arms of an adult (Communion is given to small children). The next is that of being taught to say prayers which occur in the church services and to repeat them in front of a picture identical with one of the pictures in church. As a boy grows up, if he is intelligent and devout, it is likely that he will learn more church prayers and church hymns by singing them in the church choir, and he will then take his turn, while still quite young, at reading the Epistle, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, and reciting the prayers which belong to the reader's part, at the church services. Thus the Orthodox, before he knows very much else about his religion, knows public worship and "church tradition." He knows the Church as his meeting-place with the sacramental grace of God in the 'mysteries.' This has been called "corporate mysticism"; it is something rather different from what we normally mean by the word mysticism.

Doctrine and worship are one, and doctrine is learned in the self-authenticating experience of worship. I have many times been told that it is quite possible for a child to be going to a school where religious instruction is either non-existent or extremely inadequate, and yet to become a Christian through hearing the church services and participating in them, rather than through sermons or lessons. It is even possible for children to receive in school a thoroughly atheistic education, without hearing any reply to it on the intellectual level at all, and still to believe, quite simply, that the atheistic teacher is not giving an account of religion as they find it in the worship of their church. His contentions simply have no relation at all to what the church services give them. Of course children so educated are sure to believe and practise much that is not compatible with Christianity, unless they meet with better instructed Christians. But they will pray, although told that prayer is unworthy of man, because they have joined in prayer and have known what it is. The church services of the Orthodox Church, even when in a language which is archaic in form, con-

sist of words most of which are closely akin to words in modern use. The result is that completely uncultured people who have been regularly to church since they were young are often quite well able to follow the meaning of a great part of the services and of the Gospel lessons. I am thinking here mainly of Greeks and Russians. I am not so sure about the Serbs; I am told the Church Slavonic is harder for them. The Rumanians, the Arabic-speaking Orthodox, and the Albanian Orthodox, have the church services in a language very close to modern popular Rumanian, Arabic, and Albanian. Several other languages are used in church services in Siberia among the non-Russian peoples. Any language may be used, and there is much progress going on in the making and using of translations to meet the needs of the Orthodox in Japan, France, America, Germany, and other countries where the second generation of exiles know very little Russian, and where some of the Orthodox are not people from the East at all. To strangers to the Church of course much of the service is incomprehensible. But I know from actual experiences of close friends of mine that in Greek villages where there was for a very long period the most inadequate religious instruction a remarkable amount of the meaning of the Liturgy and of the Gospels was found to have got into the minds of the people. Selected girls who ought to have been at school during the German occupation years were taken from villages in Macedonia to a domestic science school near Salonika to be taught so that they could go back to their villages and teach others. In war conditions there had been church services in most places, but very little schooling and very little systematic preaching indeed. The villages had had very poor schools before the war, and many teachers in them were quite unfit to give religious instruction. At the domestic science school, which was run by a friend of mine, the girls were taught the Greek New Testament, in the original text, and the Liturgy. They were enormously keen to learn everything they could, and they learned very quickly. But my friend was astonished at the proportion of words and sentences out of the Gospels and the Liturgy which they already knew, and of which they had at least an elementary general notion of the meaning. I think this is partly due to their having nothing else to think about and nowhere else to go for any social life in the village except to the church. The church is to the village in Greece the one theatre and concert hall and cinema and village institute. Every one goes to it, and no doubt parents have to answer children's questions about it.

This "corporate mysticism" is certainly not divorced from morality. Fasting is a corporate act to such an extent that in 1947 in a quite important provincial town in northern Greece I found no animal food on the menus of the restaurants in Lent. One does not fast to acquire merit; one fasts because the whole world fasts, and feasts with the whole world at Easter. The community is not priest-ridden. On the contrary, the priest is at the beck and call of the community. He is still, in the rural districts of Greece and Syria, a village farmer, married and known to lead a good life, whom his fellow-villagers have proposed as a candidate for the priesthood, and whom the bishop has accepted. He has a short period at one of the provincial "hieratic training schools" or a time of practical training in a monastery. He is not expected to preach. He may perhaps, in some

dioceses, be encouraged to read printed sermons and to teach the children. But his main duty is the liturgy of Baptism and the Eucharist, marriages, funerals, and services of intercession and blessing in houses and fields and shops. His parish is often a small isolated community of about fifty families in which a better-trained full-time priest would feel very isolated and would have little to do, whereas the peasant priest continues to be a farmer. The parish may be visited, once a year or more often, by the bishop or by the preachers who belong to the staff of the bishop. These preach sermons, and the hearing of a sermon, on a Sunday or a festival or a weekday, is a special festive occasion. Sacramental confession is part of the discipline of the Church, but in practice, for lack of trained confessors in the country districts and through other reasons, it does not really function as a means of religious education and instruction in the Church in Greece. Many people simply make a confession of their sinfulness in general terms and receive the blessing of the parish priest and then make their communions. When they have fallen into grave sin they go to the bishop or to the members of his staff of priests for absolution. The dioceses in Greece are small and are in some ways like large parishes.

The lack of instructed clergy is felt very strongly in Greece in particular. Before the war in Serbia and Bulgaria and Rumania, and before 1917 in Russia, the standard of education of the parish clergy was somewhat higher than in Greece and in the countries until recently part of Turkey. One reason for the shortage of well-taught clergy was the tendency of men who had completed courses in the seminaries or taken degrees in theology in the universities to prefer to remain laymen. Graduates in Orthodox theology could find positions as teachers of religious knowledge and of the classics in secondary schools. If they were good scholars they went to western Europe for further training and then taught in the theological academies and the training schools of the clergy or in the university as teachers of theology without proceeding to Holy Orders. There have been laymen who were amateur theologians in almost all periods of the history of the Orthodox Church, and it should be remembered that the majority of the members of each monastic community are lay-brothers. I think myself that one reason for this reluctance to be ordained is that the canonical age for ordination is rather late. There is thus an interval between the end of studies and the beginning of ordained life. Another reason may be that, as the European fashion of dressing and the Western manner of life spread in the Balkan States, the professional dress of the clergy, their beards and long hair, and the manner of life required of them by convention, came to seem more and more out of touch with the life of the present day. The fact that married men cannot become bishops makes a career as a lay theologian or a schoolmaster attractive to the married graduate in theology. But a considerable number of the lay theologians are men of real spiritual life. With the permission of the bishops, and under their control, the lay theologians preach. They take a part in the work of the youth organizations and catechetical schools in the larger cities and towns. A number of them are, in a certain sense, monks in lay dress; without being professed as monks in the traditional way, they have agreed to live a common life of personal poverty and celibacy and devote themselves to the service of the Church and her children

as lay-readers and lay-preachers and as organizers of various religious societies among the laity. Although many of the bishops much regret the tendency among these men to refuse ordination to the priesthood, they accept their services, understanding that they believe in the teachings of the Orthodox Church, and train those under their influence to take part in her worship and life. In the meetings of some of the societies which they organize women take a full part in the teaching activities. There is extempore prayer and some singing of hymns of a modern type in vernacular Greek.

In such societies an evangelistic approach is made to people who are out of contact with the Church. The Liturgy is explained and supplemented. Lectures are given on various matters from the Christian standpoint. In parishes, chiefly in the towns, where such societies are influential, the Liturgy is celebrated in a way which makes it easier to follow. The laity are encouraged to receive Holy Communion frequently, and confessors are trained to give spiritual counsel. Similar movements and societies to those here mentioned in Greece are arising among the Arab Orthodox in Syria and the Lebanon, among the Greek and Arab Orthodox in Egypt, and among the Orthodox of all nationalities in America. Something on the same lines was growing before the war in Serbia and Rumania. What we can find out about the religious revival in Russia seems to indicate that people are receiving Holy Communion more frequently than before and lay participation in worship is becoming more intelligent.

These religious societies, although they have the blessing of the episcopate and are Orthodox in their doctrinal basis, are the work of private initiative rather than the work of the Church in its organisational aspect. In this respect they are often compared with the monasteries in the first stage of their development, before they were regulated by canon law. They can be compared to some of the medieval guilds and fraternities in the West. But it is not fanciful to compare them to the Puritan lecturerships of the seventeenth century, and to the Methodist societies of the eighteenth century, when the Methodists were still within the Church of England. They are not dreaming of being distinct churches. Their members go to the church and lead others to the church for the reception of sacramental grace, and they recognize the authority of the Church. But, in the Church, they are called to exercise special gifts and do special work.

My hearers may complain that this is not a lecture on the outlines of Eastern Orthodox theology. But it is necessary to stress a little-understood fact. The real difference between Eastern and Western Christian theology lies not in particular doctrinal points but in the difference between two ways of approach to the whole subject. In the East the central way of approach is public worship, and doctrines are prayers rather than propositions.

The central core of these prayers is liturgical prayer addressed to the Holy Trinity by the Church of Christ. The saints are certainly very important in the religion of the Orthodox. But they are important as members of the Church by which the Eucharist is offered.

We must therefore begin our theological outlines with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. In connection with the Filioque clause there are two points

at issue. One concerns the doctrine about the Church and the other concerns the doctrine about the Holy Spirit. I am concerned here with the point about the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We in the West have become accustomed to thinking that the Holy Spirit is the love of God the Father for God the Son and, in the same way, the love of God the Son for God the Father. Thus we picture the Holy Spirit as eternally proceeding from the Son, as He eternally proceeds from the Father, being the mutual love of the Father and the Son. We are prepared to say that the relationship of Father and Son, although outside time, has some character corresponding to the relationship of cause and effect. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son *because* He proceeds from the Father. The Son has all that the Father has, except that the Father is the Father of the Son and the Son is the Son of the Father. The Father and the Son are in all respects the same, except in the one respect of their mutual relationship. They are the one single principle and cause, the one *arche* and the one *aitia*, of the existence of the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of both and the mutual love of both. In that sense it can be said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son or that He proceeds from the Father through the Son, and that the two expressions have the same meaning. That is the Roman Catholic view, also adopted by a great number of Anglican theologians. The Eastern Orthodox theologians dispute firstly the necessity of this doctrine to saving faith, and secondly its theological truth. The question of necessity is the question of the addition to the text of the Creed. I am going to discuss that later. The question of theological truth is this: The Eastern Orthodox say that the Son is begotten of the Father alone and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; the sole principle and cause, the sole *arche* and *aitia*, of the Son and the Holy Spirit is the Father. The eternal relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit, as a relationship analogous to the relation of cause and effect, is not revealed and cannot rightly be inferred. The Son and the Holy Spirit are of one being or essence. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son as well as the Spirit of the Father; but from this we cannot infer identity of relationship. The supposed identity of the two relationships is a piece of speculative theology. On the other hand, in the Gospel according to St. John, the Holy Spirit is said to be "The Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father," and our Lord in praying to the Father that "the love with which thou hast loved Me" may be in the Apostles and their followers, seems to imply that the Holy Spirit is the Love of the Father for the Son. In the baptism of our Lord we have the picture of the Holy Spirit moving from the Father to the beloved Son. In the liturgies of the Eastern Church and in some early Western liturgies the operation of the Holy Spirit is regarded as being in the Eucharist what it was in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Spirit moves on the face of the waters and then the creative Word is spoken. The Spirit overshadows Mary and then the Word becomes flesh. The Spirit comes upon the gifts of the Church and upon the communicants and then the gifts become the Body and Blood of the Word of God. The Holy Spirit is thus both received and given by the Son. The Holy Spirit brings it about that Christ is present here on earth. The creative and redemptive work of God the Holy Trinity seems to be "from the Father, through the Son or by the Son, in the Holy

Spirit" (cf. the third century doxology). Thus the eternal and essential relationships of the Persons in the Trinity are revealed only in terms of what is called the 'Monarchy' of God the Father. But their relationships in the operative or working economy of God, in terms of His 'energy' or 'work,' are known and *suffice*. The Son is sent, at His Incarnation, by the Father, in and through the Holy Spirit; the Spirit, in His 'charismata,' is sent to creation and to the Church by the Father and the Son, or by the Father through the Son. Theologians of the Eastern Church will concede that this work in time has an eternal aspect. But they will say that this is the "eternal self-manifestation of God" in the "uncreated light," wherein God is Light and Creative Life in eternity. They will say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, as the Son is begotten of the Father, while the Son is manifested by the Spirit and the Spirit is manifested by the Son.

As Dr. Pusey observed after his conversation with the Greek Archbishop Alexander Lycourgos, this suggests that the order of the Persons of the Trinity (as the Second Person and the Third Person) is a matter of the Economic Trinity rather than a matter of the Essential Trinity. That seemed to Dr. Pusey to be heresy. He therefore used his great influence to prevent the Anglican High Church party from encouraging Döllinger and the German Old Catholics in their concessions to the Eastern standpoint at the Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875. The result was that, whereas the Old Catholic Churches put brackets round the Filioque clause in the Creed in their service books, and later in several editions left it out altogether, returning to the older text of the Ecumenical Synods, the Anglicans thought that they had solved the question merely by giving their approval to a number of propositions in which the Greek word in the Creed representing the word 'proceeding' was translated by the words "issuing out of," and the Holy Spirit was said "*not* to issue out of the Son" but "to issue out of the Father through the Son." These propositions, taken from the works of St. John of Damascus, did not altogether satisfy the Eastern theologians, were considered open to much criticism by Pusey and other Anglicans, and were in any case only something in the nature of an interim report. The question has not been solved, and it would be a good thing if when we talk about the Creeds as part of the Lambeth Quadrilateral we would keep in mind the fact that the text of the Creed we call the Nicene Creed is not agreed. The Apostles' Creed is the Roman Creed; while the Eastern theologians have no objection to it, it is not, from their point of view, an officially adopted statement. The statement of Eastern theologians that the Holy Spirit does not proceed eternally from the Son has never been declared to be a heresy by the plain word of Holy Scripture or by any of the Councils which post-Reformation Anglican divines regard as General. Nor has it been declared a heresy by the Church of England since the time of the Reformation, although it seems clear that before the Reformation it was condemned among the errors of the Greek Church by the divines of England as well as by the rest of the West. Even Pusey did not want the Eastern Church to be asked to repudiate her theologians, to adopt the Western theology or to add the Filioque to the Creed. But he wanted the two texts of the Creed to have equal status. The Roman Catholic Church allows the liturgical use of both texts, but treats the longer text as authorita-

tive; all Roman Catholics must accept the Latin doctrine of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. That is logical, in view of the doctrine of the perpetual orthodoxy of the see of Rome. But our position as Anglicans in this matter seems much less self-consistent. The Creed ought to consist only of doctrines which are essential. We can, no doubt, explain the Filioque in a sense which makes it refer to the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit or to His manifestation to the creation in the divine work, and then there is no theological difficulty at all. But then we are using words equivocally and contrary to their historical meaning. Both the Anglican doctrine of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture and the respect for the integrity of any text point to the removal of the interpolation from the Creed as a basis of union.

It is best to treat the Filioque controversy as a famous historical example of the Eastern approach to the question of dogmatic definition. To the East definition does not seem a good thing in itself. It is a necessary evil, to avoid worse evils, that some doctrines should be defined and the definition made obligatory for all members of the Church. Thus it was necessary to condemn Arius and Nestorius and the Monophysites. It was necessary to condemn the Iconoclastic heresy in the eighth century. That was the work of the Ecumenical Councils of the period before the separation of East and West. It is not the Eastern Orthodox view that, since the year 787 or since the year 1054, all further definition of doctrine is *per se* impossible. Another Ecumenical Council is, in principle, possible. The Eastern Orthodox are not willing to draw up a list of doctrines or an extended form of Creed and to say of this statement that it "contains all the necessary articles of the faith" in the sense that nothing else except the points mentioned shall ever be regarded as essential. They do not think that we can replace the idea of the self-explanatory Bible with the idea of a self-explanatory catechism or a self-explanatory statement of theological doctrines. We must always bear in mind the possibility that our statements in our formularies, as well as the Bible, may be misinterpreted and made part of the basis of a heresy just as dangerous as Arianism. Therefore the Orthodox consider that the One Holy Catholic Church must always be recognized as having the power and authority to interpret Holy Scripture and the Creeds and Definitions of the Councils. God is still guiding the Church into all truth. But the Church does not add to the New Testament such a word as 'consubstantial'; she makes the Creed a commentary on the Gospels, not an addition to the Gospels. Having formulated the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed in the fourth century, and having ratified it at Chalcedon in 451, as a statement which teaches "the complete truth" concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Orthodox Church did not add to it. She issued commentaries on the Creed and on the Bible. Neither the word 'Theotokos' nor the expression "in Two Natures" was added to the Nicene Creed. Nor was any addition made in the sixth century or on the occasion of the controversy about ikons. New statements were put forward as authoritative commentaries, but the text was not affected. Similarly since the period of the Ecumenical Councils the Orthodox Church has found it possible to avoid making additions to the statement of the faith of East and West, while they

were still united, made by those Councils. She has, for her own pastoral purposes, issued commentaries on that statement, which is itself a commentary on the Bible and the Creed. But it was well said by Bessarion at Ferrara in 1438 that the Orthodox Church has not mingled the marginal notes with the text.

Even if the separation of East and West had never taken place, there would still be a real distinction to be drawn in theology between the Christological and Trinitarian outlines formulated in the Ecumenical Councils and all later definitions. The Creed is bound up with the formative period in the history of theology in which the Creed and the Liturgy took shape and became what they are. But owing to the separation of East and West it became the policy of the Church of the Byzantine Empire in the medieval period to avoid any new dogmatic definitions by which reunion negotiations might be made more difficult. It was considered best to be able to say to the West that reunion was possible for the Easterns on the basis of the 'platform' of the period before the separation. There were certain theological controversies and certain doctrinal statements in Constantinople in the twelfth and thirteenth and fourteenth ceturies which are not without a certain importance in the history of Eastern theology. The Light of the Transfiguration was declared to be the uncreated light, the energy or operation of God, and not merely a created gift of grace. Grace was declared to be uncreated, the eternal power and energy of God Himself, of which the saints are partakers. The essence of God, as distinguished from this energy in which God communicates Himself, was declared to be unknowable. But the Councils which made these statements in the fourteenth century were not declared to be Ecumenical and, to a great extent, their definitions fell into the background and were studied less than they might have been, after the Turks took Constantinople. Later doctrinal statements were made, chiefly because French Roman Catholics, Dutch and French Protestants, and even Anglicans, were seeking from the Eastern Church some statement of her sacramental doctrine and were trying to draw her into Western battles on the subject of Transubstantiation. The Calvinistic views which the Patriarch Cyrill Lucar adopted under Dutch influence were condemned, and some statements were made which modern Eastern theologians regard as having been too much under Roman Catholic influence in the details of their form. The controversy between the Reformers and the counter-Reformation was not really well understood in the East, and the statements made about it did not arise organically out of the actual situation of the Eastern Church, so that they should not be placed in the same category with the classical formulations of Eastern theology.

In the Greek bishop's profession of faith[1] there is no explicit reference to sacramental doctrine whatever. Nor is there any clear allusion to the errors attributed to Rome. The Russian oath requires that the bishop should defend his flock against Latin and other errors, but does not define Latin errors. The Greek profession of faith deals, in a Greek Patristic manner, with the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The veneration of pictures and the position of the Virgin Mother in the

[1] See the translation in *The Christian East*, Vol. 1, New Series, No. 2, pp. 53–56.

Orthodox Church can be considered later. I only want to make two points about that subject here. The first is that the Greek verb, προσκυνῶ, is the verb employed to this day when a Greek sends his compliments to any one or pays his respects to any one in authority. A bishop simply swears to pay the traditional respect to pictures. The second is this: There is in the Orthodox service books a short prayer in the concluding part of each service which is given in two forms, one for use when the bishop of the diocese is present and the other for use when he is not present. When the bishop in person is present the clergy pray God to have mercy on the congregation through the prayers of the bishop. When the bishop is absent the saints are invoked instead of the bishop. It is the regular thing in writing to a bishop in the East to say " through your prayers, my lord, I am well." It is hard to believe that the Eastern Orthodox worship the bishop with the worship proper to God. And, *mutatis mutandis*, the saints who pray for the Church are in much the same position. It is their function to pray for the whole Church to God, that God may have mercy upon the world and give peace. Invocation of the saints is primarily realization of that fact.

Eastern Orthodox theologians have considerable difficulty in seeing what Protestantism is about. This applies particularly to the Reformers' doctrine of Justification by Faith, and their condemnation of Western Catholic ideas about merit. There is behind the Reformers an experience which lies outside the historic tradition of the East. St. Augustine was translated into Greek during the later medieval period and was studied for the purposes of the controversy with Rome, but never very widely. The experience which is sometimes called 'twice-born' seems unfamiliar to the Eastern tradition. It may be found now in our generation in men who have returned to Christianity from modern Humanism or from Dialectical Materialism. I am acquainted with Orthodox instances of it. But they do not help very much in the understanding of the Reformers because they are accompanied by a recovered vision of the value of Tradition. What the Orthodox cannot understand is the idea that sacramental religion can be a terrifying religion or a burden on the soul. They can see and they often say that the importance of forms and rites can be terribly exaggerated in the religion of ordinary people. Any Greek or Russian cleric or theologian is likely to say that from time to time. And he imagines that the Reformers wanted to say something similar. But what the Greek finds to be the danger of ritual among his people is not that it is terrifying or even that it gives a sense of security so much as that it is enjoyable and moving æsthetically. It may very often have a kind of soporific effect on people who never try to penetrate to the meaning of it but are content to enjoy it. If a sense of security is given it is not the security given by the merit of one's works. It is the security given by membership of the people of God.

The Easter sermon of St. John Chrysostom, which is read every Easter morning at the end of the Liturgy, is strangely apt in its welcome to those who have not fasted and to those who have fasted, to all who will come independently of their works and deservings. The sacrament of confession always seems to be a medicine rather than a tribunal in the Eastern context. People pray for their departed friends in church in the same way as

they went to meet them in church when they were alive. They may pray for them more often when they are departed because that is the only thing to be done in love for them. But the Church prays for all the departed. It is not accurate to say that the Orthodox pray for the repose of the souls of the saints; that is not the wording of the prayer. But the Eucharist is offered on behalf of "the spirits of just men made perfect" with prayer that they may pray with the offerers and for the offerers. It is a point of medieval Greek teaching, made in controversy with Rome, that until the resurrection of the dead has come the damned are not in the ultimate hell and the saved are not in the ultimate bliss, so that prayer avails for the relief even of the damned and for the further progress even of the saved, until the last account of the whole universe in the Last Day. Thus there is no third state; there are only, as it were, two antechambers or antestates of the two final states. The prayer which aids departed sinners is certainly the prayer of all the saints of God, but the question of superabundant merit does not enter the picture in any way in Eastern theology. If there is any earthly thing upon which confidence may be placed it is certainly membership of the visible Church and dying in her visible communion. But there I would remind you of what was said in the first lecture on the Orthodox conception of the Church. It is always possible for a Church which, by outward standards, seems to be Orthodox, to fall into heresy. The heretic and the schismatic believe that they are the true Orthodox and that the Orthodox are heretics and schismatics. Therefore the covenant is not marked by infallible *external* marks. The Church is recognized by faith.

The intelligent Orthodox would always insist that forms and types ought to be understood and not merely enjoyed. But he cannot understand the iconoclasticism of Protestantism and its rejection of the fellowship of the departed saints. This is because, since he rejected Paganism, the Eastern Christian has never had to reject a religion resembling medieval Catholicism as it was seen through Protestant eyes. The rejection of Islam was a very different matter and tends to confuse the issues, as the mosque has a certain superficial likeness to a Protestant meeting-house. I have read somewhere that the first Protestants to appear in Turkey in the sixteenth century were acquitted by a Turkish religious court where they had been charged with action in favour of the Christian form of idolatry. The court decided that this new religion was very close indeed to Islam.

In the nineteenth century a great many Protestant missionaries from America and from Germany came to the Near East, some to Greece but more to the Turkish Empire. Most of them were firm fundamentalists and Puritans. They came to preach to the Jews and the Moslems, but found little response among them and, in many cases, found a certain interest in their message in the Eastern Christians, who were anxious for education and sympathetic towards fellow-Christians of whose tenets they knew little. The result was a somewhat ineffective and irritating proselytism, and a controversy mainly about the veneration of pictures and the invocation of saints. Small Protestant sects were formed in Greece and Syria; there was one in Asia Minor which came *en masse* to Greece after the First World War. But, all told, there are not more than about

6,000 Greek Protestants in a population of more than 7,000,000, and they are not increasing. The modern religious movements in Greece owe something to their stimulus and to that of Roman Catholic propagandist efforts which were also without any very great success. Some of their educational methods have been adapted and developed among the Orthodox. But an impression was created at that period, and is still maintained through controversies between the Greek Orthodox and local Protestants, that Protestantism is to be identified with an iconoclastic fundamentalism. The propagandist efforts of some of the minor sects of America are still a problem to the Orthodox in the Near East and Orthodox exiles in the West. They seem to have a certain amount of success, although it is probably not often a lasting success, among uneducated people. They have a tendency to claim that their religion is the religion of the most enlightened people in the British and American nations.

The existence of other kinds of protestantism is of course well known to better-educated clergy and lay theologians. But in those circles there is a tendency to confuse the more scholarly type of Protestantism with rationalism. Many Greek intellectuals return from university studies in Germany convinced that it is impossible for any educated man to be a Christian, and popularize the works of men like Renan. German universities are associated with a somewhat crude evolutionary materialism. America also seems to produce in the minds of Greeks who go there and come back again the idea that any kind of supernatural Christianity must be unfit for the twentieth century. Therefore the defenders of Orthodoxy, while often interested in the works of individual Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars, especially those who write apologetic treatises, are apt to see in Protestantism the roots of scepticism. The Roman Catholic claims tend to be regarded as irrelevant to the present battle against atheism, and as disruptive in their actual practical effect in Eastern Christendom, in so far as they demand the conversion of individuals to the Roman Obedience. But there are signs of much better feeling than used to be prevalent between Roman Catholics and Orthodox this side of the Iron Curtain.

If in the nineteenth century there was some inclination in the countries liberated from the Turkish Empire and in Russia to look to western Europe with an admiring eye and to hope for an assimilation with western Europe in religion as in everything else, two wars have very much weakened that inclination. The Orthodox Church has gained to some extent from the revival of cultural and social nationalism and greater interest in the history of the Byzantine period. Greece, as well as Russia, has a sense of an unfulfilled mission to the world. And it is inevitable that it should seem to the Orthodox that the Church is united in the East, where the Protestants and Roman Catholics are insignificant minorities, and where the separated Eastern Churches are confined to a few national groups. Orthodoxy can seem, in each of the Balkan States at least, to be the One Christian Church as far as that country is concerned, and can in that way be contrasted with the several competing Churches in Britain, or America, or Germany.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD